

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

FREDERICK R. RITCHIE,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL EXPRESS CORP.,

Defendant.

Case No. C04-1753L

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of his Wrongful Termination for Breach of Handbook Promises Claim" (Dkt. #139). Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier without reasonable diligence." Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1). Instead of advancing new facts or legal authority, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration consists primarily of a restatement of the arguments contained in his motion for summary judgment and response to defendant's motion for summary judgment. These arguments were considered and rejected by the Court in its April 16, 2007 Order. See Dkt. #137.

Plaintiff also argues that the Court, in its April 16, 2007 Order, "acknowledged that Mr. Ritchie presented extensive evidence of falsified complaints, falsified evidence, false statements, intentional misrepresentations, unsubstantiated rumors and unsubstantiated evidence" in the

1 course of defendant's investigation and that this finding reveals manifest error in the Court's
2 April 16, 2007 Order. Motion at p. 2.¹ Plaintiff misrepresents and misquotes the Court's Order.
3 Rather than finding that plaintiff put forward "extensive evidence" that dishonest and unfounded
4 conclusions formed the basis of defendant's investigation, the Court actually made the following
5 finding:

6 Though Ritchie makes *extensive reference* to falsified complaints, falsified
7 evidence, false statements, intentional misrepresentations, unsubstantiated
8 rumors and unsubstantiated evidence, *remarkably, he does not challenge in*
9 *any substantive way the three allegations that formed the basis of Federal*
10 *Express' decision to terminate his employment.*

11 Order at p. 12 (emphasis added). Though the Court acknowledged that plaintiff made a number
12 of assertions relating to the integrity of defendant's investigation, the Court did not find that the
13 plaintiff put forward any evidence to support such allegations. As the Court noted in the portion
14 of the April 16, 2007 Order quoted above, plaintiff has never challenged in any substantive way
15 the accuracy of the findings of the investigation that he now seeks to discredit. Because plaintiff
16 has failed to either demonstrate manifest error or put forward new facts or legal authority, his
17 motion for reconsideration is denied.

18 DATED this 30th day of May, 2007.

19
20 

21 Robert S. Lasnik
22 United States District Judge
23
24

25 ¹At one point, plaintiff goes so far as to quote the Court as finding that plaintiff presented
26 "extensive evidence" of such irregularities. *Id.* at p. 4. The Court never made such a finding.
27